Remarks

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, dated **April 17, 2006** ("Action"), in which claims 1-8 and 10-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weber (U.S. Pub No. 2003/0039209 "Weber") in view of Shanley (PCI-X System Architecture "Shanley").

Current Status of Claims:

With this amendment, claims 1-3, 11, 12, 16, 17 and 22-24 are canceled. Applicants offer to amend claims 4-8, 10, 13-15 and 18-21 as presented above. Applicants also have added new claims 25-29. Thus claims 4-8, 10, 13-15, 18-21 and 25-29 are pending. Support for the amendments and new claims as presented above can be found in the original specification, claims and/or figures. No new matter has been introduced.

Claim 4 Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Relevant portions of claim 4, as currently amended, are as follows:

> "A method, comprising:
> receiving… one or more completion packets *for a request transaction*, the one or more completion packets are for a request transaction addressed to an agent at a completing device…, *each completion packet including a completion packet header, the request transaction to include* one of a memory read request, an input/output read request and a configuration read request,…; and
> *determining* whether the completion packet header included with each completion packet includes a completion status that indicates other than a successful completion of the request transaction, wherein based on an indication of other than a successful completion of the request transaction:
> *storing the completer identification* in a first register,

Application No. 10/040,702
Atty. Docket No. P13768

-12-

Examiner Shah
Art Unit 2616

> *indicating in a second register* that an *unsuccessful*
> *completion* was received for the request transaction, and
> *using the completer identification in the first*
> *register and the indication in the second register to report*
> an error condition associated with the request transaction."

Emphasis added.

Weber fails to teach or suggest at least the above cited portions of claim 4. Weber discloses acknowledgements from a responder for packets transmitted from a requester to the responder. See paragraph 0018. But Weber only attaches the general term of "message" to these packets and does not disclose the type of request transaction as cited in claim 4 above, e.g., a memory read request, an input/output read request and a configuration read request. Additionally, according to Weber, "the requester completes a message by writing a completion code..." See paragraph 0018. Consequently, completion status is *determined by the requester and not the responder*. Thus, Weber also fails to teach or suggest *completion packet headers* for each completion packet *received from a completing device* as cited above in claim 1.

Since Weber fails to disclose completion packet headers for completion packets, Weber also does not disclose "determining whether the *completion packet header* included with each completion packet includes a completion status that indicates other than a successful completion of the request transaction." See claim 4. Emphasis added. Weber also does not disclose storing a completer identification in a register, indicating in another register that an unsuccessful completion was received and using the completer identification and the unsuccessful indication to report an error condition.

Shanley was not referenced in the Action to cure the above stated deficiencies in Weber to support a *prima facie* 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4. Applicants submit that Shanley does not cure these deficiencies and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 4 be

withdrawn. Claims 5, 6, 13, 18, and 19 are dependant on claim 4. Thus, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these dependent claims be withdrawn as well.

Claim 7 Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Relevant portions of claim 7, as currently amended, are as follows:

> "A method, comprising:
> responding to a request transaction from a requesting device at a completing device..., *the request transaction includes* one of a memory read request, an input/output read request and a configuration read request,...; and
> determining whether an error condition associated with servicing the request transaction exists, wherein if an error condition exists;
> the transaction layer implemented at the general input/output port to include *assembling a completion packet for the request transaction, the completion packet to include a completion packet header,....*"

Emphasis added.

Weber fails to teach or suggest at least the above cited elements of claim 7. As mentioned above for claim 4, Weber only attaches the general term of "message" to packets sent to a responder and also *only the requester determines the completion status of a message*. As a result, Weber fails to teach or suggest the assembling of a completion packet for the request transaction as emphasized in claim 7 above. Shanely was not referenced in the Action to address these deficiencies in Weber to support a *prima facie* 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7. Applicants submit that Shanley does not cure these deficiencies and request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn. Claims 8, 10, 14, 15, 20, 21 and 25 are dependant on claim 7. Thus, Applicants request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of these dependent claims be withdrawn as well.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 4-8, 10, 13-15, 18-21 and 25-29 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. *The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.*

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,
David M. Lee, et al.

Date: __June 23, 2006__

by: /s/Ted A. Crawford /Reg. No. 50,610/
Ted A. Crawford, Reg. No. 50,610
Patent Attorney for Assignee Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
PO Box 5326
SC4-202
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Tel. (503) 712.2799

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: 6/23/2006

Signature: _Julie Dussault_   6/23/2006
Julie Dussault   Date